




to which objection is made.” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (cleaned up); see 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). Absent a timely objection, “a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315 (quotation omitted). If a party makes only general objections, de novo review is not required. See Wells v. Shriners Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1997). “In order to preserve for appeal an issue in a magistrate judge’s report, a party must object to the finding or recommendation on that issue with sufficient specificity so as reasonably to alert the district court of the true ground for the objection.” Martin v. Duffy, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017) (quotation omitted); see United States v. Midgette, 478 F.3d 616, 622 (4th Cir. 2007).

The court has reviewed the M&R, the record, and plaintiffs’ objections. As for those portions of the M&R to which plaintiffs made no objection, the court is satisfied that there is no clear error on the face of the record. As for the objections, the court has reviewed the objections and the M&R de novo. The court has considered the factors necessary for an ex parte TRO. Plaintiffs have not proven all four factors. Plaintiffs’ objections are overruled.

In sum, the court OVERRULES plaintiffs’ objections to the M&R [D.E. 27] and ADOPTS the M&R [D.E. 26]. The court ORDERS plaintiffs to serve the complaint and motion for a preliminary injunction on defendants. Judge Jones shall proceed with the hearing on plaintiffs’ request for a preliminary injunction on April 24, 2023 at 10:30 a.m., in Courtroom 100, 1003 S. 17th St., Wilmington, North Carolina.

SO ORDERED. This 6 day of April, 2023.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JAMES C. DEVER III  
United States District Judge